

19 Dec 1975

"There has been a great deal of attention paid to the fact that somehow if the feminist movement pays attention to anyone but white middle-class straight women, we will somehow deviate from course. . . . If you challenge gender role stereotypes, you must understand the homosexual issue."

A few more enthymemes like that—along with a few more defeats like the New York and New Jersey ERA, and the fizzling of the "Alice Doesn't" women's strike—and even the most liberated white middle-class straight women may decide sisterhood is not enough to hold NOW together.

## George Bush and the CIA

Perhaps the only top governmental post for which George Bush is not a plausible choice is the one for which President Ford has nominated him, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In the first place, though Bush is intelligent, able, and patriotic, he has had little or no experience with the technical aspects of intelligence operations. He no doubt could master them, and master the equally unfamiliar administrative requirements of the post, given, say, three or four years on the job. But no one, repeat, no one, expects Bush to stay at the CIA that long.

Even more serious as a disqualification is the fact that Bush's career has been in partisan politics, as a congressman, candidate for the Senate, and chairman of the Republican Party. A thoroughly honorable career, and Bush undoubtedly has a bright future, but the post of CIA Director is one place in which partisan politics should not intrude, whether consciously or unconsciously. Furthermore, it is important for the future of the agency that the public should perceive it as conspicuously non-partisan, and for that perception the identity of the Director is crucial. The ideal intelligence man would be a pure technician, preferably anonymous, a lens transmitting the facts without refraction. Though that ideal cannot really be achieved it should at least be approximated. George Bush would serve both himself and his country well by withdrawing his name from consideration.

## Catholic Stirrings

In the years following Vatican II, the Catholic Church experienced a lesion of political and cultural clout. The period when Catholic opinion mattered to a legislator, or when a Catholic leader such as Francis Cardinal Spellman could actually stand up to the *New York Times*, began to seem almost antediluvian. Issues of central importance were buried beneath a bland ecumenicity. Culturally, the "opening" to modernity all too often entailed uncritical submergence in it.

Elsewhere in this issue, Malachi Martin discusses the

chilling spread of a gnostic heresy in the Third World, where Catholics—including members of the hierarchy—increasingly identify Christian doctrine with Marxism [see p. 1470]. But at the annual meeting of the Catholic bishops in Washington at the end of November, there were signs of a recovery of nerve on the part of Catholic leadership. The bishops launched a massive, national anti-abortion campaign designed to produce political action. Abortion is hardly a "Catholic" issue, any more than the freedom of Israel is exclusively a Jewish issue, and, indeed, Catholics often have seemed less effective than many Protestants and Jews in deploring the presumptuous and dangerous decision of the Supreme Court. This reticence may now change. And John Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia, former president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, took on the issue of aid to parochial schools and put it squarely in the context of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. He criticized national Jewish organizations for being insensitive to Catholic parents' concern over the fate of the parochial schools, and characterized their opposition to parochial school aid as "bitter."

What these initial stirrings amount to remains to be seen, but in their transactions with democratic pluralism some Catholic leaders seem to be indicating that the day of uncritical fawning may be drawing to a close.

## Kingfish Brewster Goes to London

Over the years the utterances of Yale's president Kingman Brewster have seldom left us plain folks in a state of hushed admiration, but on Thanksgiving Day Mr. Brewster delivered an address to the English Speaking Union in London that deserves to be long remembered. It is radiant with a kind of inspired common sense. Herewith, a few central excerpts:

"The torture which freedom has suffered in the Second and Third World makes 'the rights of Englishmen' all the more precious. . . . Our traditional values are not the natural and inevitable order of mankind. They are the hard won and fragile achievement of the English-speaking Peoples. . . .

"[The] challenge to us both is, in good part, strictly economic. Thus, if government remains representative, will it not always cater to the demands of the present at the expense of the future? Can wage settlements be expected to leave a surplus for investment? Will taxation and inflation together dry up savings? Will government itself be under inexorable pressure to favor consumption at the expense of capital? . . .

"This inflationary bias of representative government seems to me the greatest threat to the survival of a democratic political economy. . . . We need some 'higher law' to restrain the natural temptation to use the spending power for political self-perpetuation. If we do not